

Remark on orbital precession due to central-force perturbations

O. I. Chashchina

Department of physics, Novosibirsk State University, 630 090, Novosibirsk, Russia

Z. K. Silagadze

Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics and Novosibirsk State University, 630 090, Novosibirsk, Russia

This is a comment on the recent paper by G. S. Adkins and J. McDonnell “Orbital precession due to central-force perturbations” published in Phys. Rev. D75 (2007), 082001 [arXiv:gr-qc/0702015]. We show that the main result of this paper, the formula for the precession of Keplerian orbits induced by central-force perturbations, can be obtained very simply by the use of Hamilton’s vector.

In the recent paper G. S. Adkins and J. McDonnell reconsidered the old problem of perihelion precession of Keplerian orbits under the influence of arbitrary central-force perturbations. Their main result is the formula for perihelion precession in the form of a one-dimensional integral convenient for numerical calculations.

The reason why this well studied and essentially textbook problem [2] came into the focus of the current research is the recent usage of this classical effect to constrain hypothetical modifications of Newtonian gravity from higher dimensional models [3], as well as the density of dark matter in the solar system [4].

Traditionally the simplest way to study the perihelion motion is the use of the Runge-Lenz vector [5, 6]. The Runge-Lenz vector

$$\vec{A} = \vec{v} \times \vec{L} - \alpha \vec{e}_r \quad (1)$$

is the extra constant of motion originated from the hidden symmetry of the Coulomb/Kepler problem [7]. Here $\alpha = GmM$, \vec{L} is the angular momentum vector and \vec{v} is the relative velocity of a planet of mass m with respect to the Sun of mass M . Geometrically the Runge-Lenz vector points towards the perihelion. Therefore its precession rate is just the precession rate of the perihelion [8].

However, we will use not the Runge-Lenz vector but its less known cousin, the Hamilton vector [9, 10, 11, 12]

$$\vec{u} = \vec{v} - \frac{\alpha}{L} \vec{e}_\varphi, \quad (2)$$

where φ is the polar angle in the orbit plane. This very useful vector constant of motion of the Kepler problem was well known in the past, but mysteriously disappeared from textbooks after the first decade of the twentieth century [9, 11, 12, 13].

Of course, \vec{A} and \vec{u} are not independent constants of motion. The relation between them is

$$\vec{A} = \vec{u} \times \vec{L}. \quad (3)$$

Remembering that the magnitude of the Runge-Lenz vector is $A = \alpha e$, where e is the eccentricity of the orbit [5], we get from (3) the magnitude of the Hamilton vector

$$u = \frac{\alpha e}{L}. \quad (4)$$

If the potential $U(r)$ contains a small central-force perturbation $V(r)$ besides the Coulomb binding potential,

$$U(r) = -\frac{\alpha}{r} + V(r),$$

the Hamilton vector (as well as the Runge-Lenz vector) ceases to be conserved and begins to precess with the same rate as the Runge-Lenz vector, because according to (3) the two vectors are perpendicular.

To calculate the precession rate of the Hamilton vector we first find its time derivative

$$\dot{\vec{u}} = -\frac{1}{\mu} \frac{dV(r)}{dr} \vec{e}_r, \quad (5)$$

where $\mu = \frac{mM}{m+M}$ is the reduced mass. To get (5), we have used Newton’s equation of motion for \vec{v} and the equation $\dot{\vec{e}}_\varphi = -\dot{\varphi} \vec{e}_r$.

Now the precession rate of the vector \vec{u} can be found as [6]

$$\vec{\omega} = \frac{\vec{u} \times \dot{\vec{u}}}{u^2}. \quad (6)$$

Because of (2), (5) and (6) only the tangential component $r\dot{\varphi}$ of the velocity vector $\vec{v} = \dot{r}\vec{e}_r + r\dot{\varphi}\vec{e}_\varphi$ contributes and we get

$$\vec{\omega} = \frac{1}{\mu u^2} \left(r\dot{\varphi} - \frac{\alpha}{L} \right) \frac{dV(r)}{dr} \vec{e}_r \times \vec{e}_\varphi = \frac{p}{\alpha e^2} \left(r\dot{\varphi} - \frac{\alpha}{L} \right) \frac{dV(r)}{dr} \vec{k},$$

where \vec{k} is the unit vector in the z -direction and

$$p = \frac{L^2}{\mu \alpha} \quad (7)$$

is the semi-latus rectum of the unperturbed orbit.

Therefore, under the complete orbital cycle the Hamilton vector and hence the perihelion of the orbit revolves by the angle

$$\Delta\Theta_p = \int_0^T \omega dt = \frac{p}{\alpha e^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \left(r - \frac{\alpha}{L\dot{\varphi}} \right) \frac{dV(r)}{dr} d\varphi. \quad (8)$$

However, $L = \mu r^2 \dot{\varphi}$ and, therefore,

$$\frac{\alpha}{L\dot{\varphi}} = \frac{r^2}{p}.$$

Besides, to first order in the perturbation potential $V(r)$ we can use the unperturbed orbit equation

$$\frac{p}{r} = 1 + e \cos \varphi$$

while integrating (8) and get

$$\Delta\Theta_p = \frac{p^2}{\alpha e} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\cos \varphi}{(1 + e \cos \varphi)^2} \frac{dV(r)}{dr} d\varphi. \quad (9)$$

If now we introduce the new integration variable $z = \cos \varphi$, equation (9) transforms into

$$\Delta\Theta_p = -\frac{2p}{\alpha e^2} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{z}{\sqrt{1-z^2}} \frac{dV\left(\frac{p}{1+ez}\right)}{dz} dz, \quad (10)$$

and this is just equation (30) from [1] up to the applied notations.

The extreme simplicity of this back-of-envelope derivation demonstrates clearly that the real backbone behind the Adkins and McDonnell perihelion precession formula is the Hamilton's vector, the lost sparkling diamond of introductory level mechanics.

After this work had been completed, we became aware of the paper [14], in which the author rediscovers the Hamilton vector and advocates essentially the same treatment of the perihelion precession problem as described in this note. "Everything has been said before, but since nobody listens we have to keep going back and beginning all over again" [15].

Acknowledgments

An occasional conversation with I. B. Khriplovich triggered our interest to this problem. The work of Z.K.S. is supported in part by grants Sci.School-905.2006.2 and RFBR 06-02-16192-a.

-
- [1] G. S. Adkins and J. McDonnell, “Orbital precession due to central-force perturbations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 082001 (2007) [arXiv:gr-qc/0702015].
 - [2] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Mechanics* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1976), Sec. 15. Prob. 3.
 - [3] See, for example, G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov and M. Zaldarriaga, “The accelerated universe and the Moon,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 024012 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0212069].
 - [4] I. B. Khriplovich and E. V. Pitjeva, “Upper limits on density of dark matter in Solar system,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 615 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0601422]; I. B. Khriplovich, “Density of dark matter in Solar system and perihelion precession of planets,” arXiv:astro-ph/0702260.
 - [5] T. Garavaglia, “The Runge-Lenz vector and Einstein perihelion precession,” *Am. J. Phys.* **55**, 164 (1987).
 - [6] M. G. Stewart, “Precession of the perihelion of Mercury’s orbit,” *Am. J. Phys.* **73**, 730 (2005).
 - [7] R. C. O’Connell and K. Jagannathan, “illustrating Dynamical Symmetries in Classical Mechanics: The Laplace-Runge-Lenz Vector Revisited,” *Am. J. Phys.* **71**, 243 (2003) [arXiv:physics/0212043], and references therein.
 - [8] See the second paper in [14].
 - [9] R. P. Martínez-y-Romero, H. N. Núñez-Yépez and A. L. Salas-Brito, “The Hamilton vector as an extra constant of motion in the Kepler problem,” *Eur. J. Phys.* **14**, 71 (1993).
 - [10] H. N. Núñez-Yépez and A. L. Salas-Brito, “The velocity hodograph for an arbitrary Kepler motion,” *Eur. J. Phys.* **21**, L39 (2000) and references therein.
 - [11] G. Munoz, “Vector constants of the motion and orbits in the Coulomb/Kepler problem,” *Am. J. Phys.* **71**, 1292 (2003) [arXiv:physics/0303106] and references therein.
 - [12] J. T. Wheeler, “Not so Classical Mechanics - Unexpected Symmetries of Classical Motion,” *Can. J. Phys.* **83**, 91 (2005) [arXiv:physics/0511054] and references therein.
 - [13] H. Goldstein, “More on the prehistory of the Laplace or Runge-Lenz vector,” *Am. J. Phys.* **44**, 1123 (1976).
 - [14] B. Davies, “Elementary theory of perihelion precession,” *Am. J. Phys.* **51**, 909 (1983); D. Ebner, “Comments on B. Davies’s ‘Derivation of perihelion precession’,” *Am. J. Phys.* **53**, 374 (1985).
 - [15] Aphorism of Andre Gide. See A. Gide, *The Tractate of Narcissus (Theory of Symbol)*, translated by A. Mangravite, *The Book of Masks; Atlas Arkhive Two: French Symbolist & Decadent Writing of the 1890s*, (Atlas Press, London, 1994).